

### **Remarks**

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 6, 8-13, and 17-20 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 8-13, and 17-20; and cancelled claims 2-5, 7, and 14-16. No claims have been added in this Amendment. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 6, and 13 are the only independent claims.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action mailed June 10, 2004, the Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,983,158 issued to Suzuki et al. ("Suzuki").

The Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Suzuki and has amended independent claims 1 and 13 and has written claim 6 as an independent claim to more clearly define thereover. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 to include limitations from dependent claims 2-5; and has amended independent claim 13 to include limitations from dependent claims 14-16. As indicated below, the Examiner rejected these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Suzuki and other cited prior art.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 are believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Suzuki. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 7-12, 14, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,537 issued to Suman et al. ("Suman"). The Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 6, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Suman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,674 issued to Park ("Park").

As indicated above, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 to include limitations from dependent claims 2-5; and has amended independent claim 13 to include limitations from dependent claims 14-16. Thus, whether amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Suzuki in view of Suman and Park is at issue.

**1. The Claimed Invention**

The claimed invention, as recited in representative amended independent claim 1, is a telematics radio for providing driving directions to an operator of a vehicle. The telematics radio includes a receiver, memory, a processor, and an interface. The receiver receives a position signal indicative of the current location of the vehicle. The memory stores the location of at least one pre-selected destination. The processor determines driving directions from the current location of the vehicle to each pre-selected destination based on the position signal and map information.

The interface receives a request from the operator for the driving directions to a desired pre-selected destination. The interface provides the operator with the driving directions to the desired pre-selected destination. The interface includes buttons and associates pre-selected destinations with respective buttons. The interface receives a request from the operator for the driving directions to a desired pre-selected destination in response to the operator pressing the button associated with the desired pre-selected destination. In response

to receiving an interface deactivation signal, the interface is disabled from providing the operator with driving directions to the pre-selected destinations such that the interface ignores requests from the operator for the driving directions to the pre-selected destinations in response to the operator pressing the buttons associated with the pre-selected destinations.

Claim 6, as amended in independent form, recites another telematics radio similar to the telematics radio set forth in amended independent claim 1 but further recites that the interface has a HOME button which is associated with the home address of the operator. Amended independent claim 13 provides a method which is associated with the telematics radio set forth in amended independent claim 1.

## **2. The Claimed Invention Compared to Suzuki, Suman, and Park**

The claimed invention generally differs from Suzuki, Suman, and Park in that in the claimed invention the interface is disabled from providing the operator with driving directions to pre-selected destinations (the locations of the pre-selected destinations being stored in memory) in response to receiving a deactivation signal such that the interface ignores a request from the operator for the driving directions to a desired pre-selected destination in response to the operator pressing an interface button associated with the desired pre-selected destination.

Suman teaches a Vehicle Communication and Remote Control System for the “remote control of vehicle functions” (Abstract) and the “remote control and programming of vehicular components and accessories” (col. 1, lines 39-45) such that the system “may be used to immobilize and disable the vehicle in response to an appropriate command delivered in a radio frequency (RF) paging signal” (col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 2) and for the vehicle owner to use the system “to immobilize a vehicle to insure safe storage of the vehicle” (col. 2, lines 29-32). With the use of the system taught by Suman, “a certain vehicle option” can be “enabled or disabled” remotely. “Such an operation may, for example, be the activation or deactivation of a ‘LAST DOOR LOCKS ALL DOORS’ feature” (col. 7, lines 40-65).

As such, Suman generally teaches that "vehicle functions" can be remotely controlled. Such a general teaching likely pre-dates Suman by many years with the advent of vehicle anti-theft systems, race car systems, etc. The claimed invention differs from this general teaching by reciting a specific limitation in which the interface is disabled from providing the operator with driving directions to pre-selected destinations (the locations of the pre-selected destinations being stored in memory) in response the interface receiving an interface disabling signal which may be remotely or directly received by the interface.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of Suzuki, Suman, and Park. Claims 8-12 and 17-20 depend from one of amended independent claims 1 and 13 and include the limitations therein. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1, 6, 8-13, and 17-20, as amended, meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID SZIRAKI et al.

By 

James N. Kallis  
Reg. No. 41,102  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 17, 2004

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351